1

2 3

4 5

6

7

8 9

VS.

WESTERN SURETY COMPANY, et al.,

Martin and Mr. Riggio appeared.

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

voluntarily turned over because they involve confidential records of employees. The Court directed Mr.

Riggio to direct his accountant to turn over the documents so that Mr. Riggio could turn them over to

the Plaintiffs. Mr. Riggio indicated he understood the Court's instructions, and would comply. The

Defendants.

Court set the matter for a follow-up status conference on March 24, 2011 to ensure Mr. Riggio and his

the custody of his accountant, Mr. Gerald Marks, who believes that the records should not be

accountant had complied with the Court's order. At the March 24, 2011 hearing counsel for the

Plaintiffs expressed skepticism that all of the documents and records sought in post-judgment

proceedings had been turned over. However, Mr. Riggio assured the Court that he had conducted a

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

The Court conducted hearings on March 10, 2011 and March 24, 2011 on Plaintiffs' Motion For

The motion for sanctions involves efforts by the Plaintiff, Judgment Creditors to complete an

Sanctions (Dkt. #113). At the March 10, 2011 hearing Daryl E. Martin and Wesley J. Smith appeared

on behalf of the Plaintiffs and Bione Riggio appeared pro se. At the March 24, 2011 hearing Mr.

audit and collect a judgment entered against Riggio Brothers Construction Inc. ("RBCI"), and its

principle, Bione D. Riggio ("Riggio"). The Court initially set the matter for hearing on March 10,

2011. Mr. Riggio appeared and indicated that the payroll records and other documents at issue were in

EMPLOYEE PAINTERS TRUST, et al., Case No. 2:09-cv-01831-KJD-PAL Plaintiffs.

**ORDER** 

(Mot. /Sanctions - Dkt. #113)

## Case 2:09-cv-01831-KJD-PAL Document 139 Filed 04/08/11 Page 2 of 2

thorough search of his own records to find all documents responsive to Plaintiffs' document requests, and had received and turned over all responsive documents in the care, custody, and control of his accountant. Having reviewed and considered Plaintiffs' motion, and the representations made at both of the hearings, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanction (Dkt. #113) is DENIED. Dated this 6<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011. United States Magistrate Judge